

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The rejections presented in the Office Action dated September 14, 2007 (hereinafter Office Action) have been considered. Claims 94-118 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration of the pending claims and allowance of the application in view of the present response is respectfully requested.

The amendment filed 8/2/2007 is objected to because, according to the Office Action, the amendment introduced new matter into the disclosure of the invention. Claims 51-93 are rejection based on 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 81-88 and 93 are rejected based on 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicants respectfully traverse, but in the interests of facilitating prosecution have cancelled Claims 51-93 without prejudice or disclaimer. Thus, without acquiescence of the rejections/objections or reasons therefor, the Applicants reserve the right to file continuing applications involving the original subject matter of the application, including that subject matter associated with cancelled Claims 51-93. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections/objections to Claims 51-93 are now moot.

In lieu of further amendment, the Applicants have added new Claims 94-118. These claims are fully supported in the Specification as filed, and therefore no new matter has been added. As to independent Claims 94, 111, 116, and 117, for example, IMS-specific services are described on page 11, lines 17-26 and page 13, lines 9-11 of the Specification as filed; binding of the CS communication flow and IMS-specific service is described in page 13, lines 16-19 of the Specification as filed. As to Claims 95 and 112, initiating CS communication flow after the sending of the SIP INVITE message but before the establishment of the IMS-specific service is described on page 14, lines 21-23 of the Specification as filed. As to Claims 99-101, 115, and 118, multiparty CS conferencing calls facilitated by a server are described on page 13, line 24 to page 14, line 2 of the Specification as filed, and FIG. 9 as filed.

Further, Applicants submit that Claims 94-118 are allowable over the prior art relied upon in the previous Office Action mailed on May 4, 2007. Applicants respectfully submit

that Claims 94-118 are non-obvious over WO 03/003767 to Soininen (hereinafter "Soininen") in combination with U.S. Publication No. 2002/0172338 by Lee (hereinafter "Lee"). The combination of Soininen and Lee at least fails to teach or suggest establish an IMS-specific service between a plurality of terminals coupled to the IMS network, and further fails to teach or suggest binding a CS communication flow together in the terminals with the IMS-specific service. Although there may be additional reasons why the combination of Soininen and Lee does not render Claims 94-118 obvious, Applicants submit that the combination of references at least fails to teach the features described above.

Authorization is given to charge Deposit Account No. 50-3581 (NOKM.079PA) any necessary fees for this filing. If the Examiner believes it necessary or helpful, the undersigned attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss any issues related to this case.

Respectfully submitted,

HOLLINGSWORTH & FUNK, LLC
8009 34th Avenue South, Suite 125
Minneapolis, MN 55425
952.854.2700

Date: 30 Oct 2007

By: 

William B. Ashley
Reg. No. 51,419